

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of invention Group I, Claims 1-26, in the reply filed on 28 October 2009 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the claims of the present application would appear to be part of an overlapping search area. This is not found persuasive because the inventions are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together and are clearly distinct because each has separate utility and there would be a serious burden on the Examiner if the restriction is not required. Even if the different classification were not sufficient to place a burden on the Examiner, which is not admitted, burden would still be caused by, for example, the different fields of search required for the different groups. For example, group I would require search queries related to detecting a presence of one or more users which would not be required for groups II-IV; group II would require search queries related to maintaining a content guide which would not be required for groups III-IV; group III would require search queries related to receiving a content guide and with items arranged in a parent-child hierarchical structure and controlling access according to an access rating in the content guide which would not be required for group IV. Clearly, this places a serious burden on the Examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Drawings

Art Unit: 2437

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Fig. 1, item 130; Fig. 4, item 460; Fig. 6, item 600; Fig. 7, item 700; Fig. 8, item 800; Fig. 9, item 900; Fig. 15, item 1508; Fig. 17, item 1708; Fig. 19, item 1910; Fig. 20, item 2010; and, Fig. 22, item 2212. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

There appears to be a typographical error on page 6, section 0032, line 4, where "communications transmissions **132**" should be "communications transmissions - -130- -" as depicted in Fig. 1.

There appears to be a typographical error on page 6, section 0032, line 6, where “Communications transmission **132**” should be “Communications transmissions - - 130 - -” as depicted in Fig. 1.

There appears to be a typographical error on page 14, section 0066, line 6, where “RFID tag **332**” should be “RFID tag - - 330 - -” as depicted in Fig. 3.

There appears to be a typographical error on page 15, section 0071, lines 1-2, where “watermark detecting / decoding module **326**” should be “watermark detecting / decoding module - - 360 - -” as depicted in Fig. 3.

There appears to be a typographical error on page 16, section 0072, line 2, where “RFID tag **332**” should be “RFID tag - - 330 - -” as depicted in Fig. 3.

There appears to be a typographical error on page 16, section 0074, line 6, where “RFID reader **432**” should be “RFID reader - - 430 - -” as depicted in Fig. 4.

There appears to be a typographical error on page 17, section 0079, lines 1-2, where “encoding / decoding module **426**” should be “encoding / decoding module - - 460 - -” as depicted in Fig. 4.

There appears to be a typographical error on page 17, section 0080, line 2, where “RFID reader **432**” should be “RFID reader - - 430 - -” as depicted in Fig. 4.

There appears to be a typographical error on page 17, section 0080, line 3, where “watermark encoding / decoding module **426**” should be “watermark encoding / decoding module - - 460 - -” as depicted in Fig. 4.

There appears to be a typographical error on page 21, section 0095, lines 7-8, where “For example, in FIG. 7, a sub-menu of items is provided after selection of

VIDEO in FIG. 8” should be “For example, in FIG. 7, a sub-menu of items is provided after selection of VIDEO in FIG. - - 6 - - “ to correspond to the figures.

There appears to be a typographical error on page 21, section 0095, lines 8-9, where “As shown in FIG. 8, the user is offered menu items...” should be “As shown in FIG. - - 7 - -, the user is offered menu items...” to correspond to the figures.

There appears to be a typographical error on page 23, section 0101, lines 5-6, where “In this example, content guide **100** includes...” should be “In this example, content guide - - 1000 - - includes...” as depicted in Fig. 10.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. **Claims 8 and 38** are objected to because of the following informalities:
5. There appears to be a typographical error on line 8 of Claim 38, where the limitation “access rights defining a suitability **of** unsuitability” should be written as “access rights defining a suitability - - or - - unsuitability”.
6. There appears to be a grammatical error on line 1 of Claim 8, where “the determined access **rights is** based” does not have subject-verb agreement.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2437

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10-15, 18-20, 23-26, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maissel et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0088872 A1), hereinafter "Maissel", in view of Thomas (U.S. Patent No. 7,134,130 B1), hereinafter "Thomas".

9. Regarding claim 1, Maissel discloses "controlling user access," i.e., providing conditional access and parental control over content (page 17, sections 0281-0282); "by one or more users each having associated therewith a wireless communications device," i.e., apparatus is operated by user via remote control for parental control or control by a person who has right to control what programs another person, or persons, may view and/ or record/delete, and/or otherwise use (page 10, sections 0174 and 0179, page 11, sections 0184 and 0199, page 17, sections 0280-0282, and page 20, section 0342); "to content transmitted across a communications medium," i.e., apparatus can operate as a set top box and communicates to receive content (page 16, sections 0266-0268, and page 17, sections 0276-0279 and 0285); "comprising: detecting of one or more users in at least one region in which content receivable by at least one receiver terminal may be consumed via the one or more users' wireless communications devices by wireless communications," i.e., each member of the family of the user may select a corresponding agent by using a different remote control (page

Art Unit: 2437

19, sections 0321-0324); “and determining access rights to content based on the detected one or more users,” i.e., the agent may determine for each associated user portions of the program which may require parental control and the user may be required to provide identification to prove that they are entitled to access a program (pages 19-20, section 0326 and page 22, sections 0375-0376); “the access rights defining a suitability or unsuitability of one or more users to consume content,” i.e., parental control is control by a person who has the right to control what programs another person or persons may view and/or record / delete, and/or otherwise use (page 17, section 0282); content requiring parental control may include programs having a rating unsuitable for children (page 10, sections 0168 and 0179).

Maissel does not specifically disclose detecting a presence of one or more users. Thomas, however, discloses “detecting a presence of one or more users in at least one region in which content receivable by at least one receiver terminal may be consumed,” i.e., user recognition input device determines that an additional user is newly present in a given area having access to the display (col. 7, lines 40-48 and col. 9, lines 14-49); “determining access rights to content based on the detected one or more users,” i.e., controlling access to information based on content of the information and user identity (col. 5, lines 43-67 and col. 6, lines 1-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maissel’s television system that maintains a viewer preference profile and identifies viewers to control access to programs with

Thomas's technique of detecting users in a viewing area in order to automate the detection of viewers to improve the control of access to displayed information.

10. **Regarding claim 2, in view of claim 1**, Maissel discloses "wherein content is broadcasted or multicasted for receipt by the receiver terminal," i.e., apparatus receives programs by broadcast (page 16, sections 0266-0267).

11. **Regarding claim 5, in view of claim 1**, Maissel discloses "wherein the determined access rights is determined according to at least an access rights level of one detected user, the access rights level enables determination of a suitability or unsuitability of particular content or content-types for consumption by the user," i.e., parental control allows a person to control what programs another person, or persons, may view and/or record/delete, and/or otherwise use (page 17, sections 0281-0282 and page 20, sections 0342-0343).

12. **Regarding claim 6, in view of claim 5**, Maissel discloses "wherein the access rights level indicates one of a maturity of a user, suitable content type, and unsuitable content-type," i.e., parental control indicates control of a person who is less mature and a program may contain material unsuited for younger viewers (page 17, section 0282 and page 10, section 0168).

13. **Regarding claim 7, in view of claim 5**, Thomas discloses "wherein the determined access rights comprises a highest or lowest access rights level of the detected users," i.e., the system automatically controls the program content to match a content suitable for the entire audience present (col. 10, lines 6-26), and if a person not

Art Unit: 2437

allowed to view content enters the room, the video and/or audio is automatically blocked (col. 8, lines 52-67 and col. 9, lines 1-13).

14. **Regarding claim 8, in view of claim 5**, Thomas discloses “wherein the determined access rights is based according to a combination of access rights level of the detected users,” i.e., based on the content type and set of persons in the audience, the content is blocked, skipped, or bleeped, and only objectionable portions can be skipped if certain non-allowed persons are present (col. 8, lines 4-19).

15. **Regarding claim 10, in view of claim 5**, Thomas discloses “further comprising retrieving an access rights level for one or more detected users from a storage facility,” i.e., decision and command processor processes recognition signal according to viewing criteria signal from stored viewing criteria, and decision and command processor generates a control signal (col. 6, lines 52-67 and col. 7, lines 1-5).

16. **Regarding claim 11, in view of claim 1**, Maissel discloses “further comprising: selectively controlling access or consumption of receivable content by the one or more detected users according to at least one of the determined access rights and access rating of receivable content,” i.e., providing parental control of data (page 17, sections 0281-0282) and a preference profile associated with a child may cause the intelligent agent to eliminate programs from a guide that are not suitable for viewing by children (page 11, sections 0184-0188, 0192, and 0198-0199), and the viewer can determine to not include programs unsuitable for children according to a viewer preference profile (page 10, sections 0174-0179).

Art Unit: 2437

17. **Regarding claim 12, in view of claim 11**, Thomas discloses “wherein the selectively controlling access comprises filtering received content for output by the receiver terminal to restrict or allow access or consumption of received content according to the determined access rights,” i.e., a synchronized moment-to-moment content type indication allows the decision and command processor to block, skip or “bleep” based on content type and set of persons in the audience (col. 8, lines 4-19).

18. **Regarding claim 13, in view of claim 11**, Maissel discloses “wherein the selectively controlling access comprises filtering a content guide indicating content or content-types receivable by the receiver terminal,” i.e., the intelligent agent customizes program schedule in accordance with one or more viewer profiles to eliminate certain programs from the guide or modifying an icon to be non-objectionable for viewing by children (page 11, sections 0184-0199).

19. **Regarding claim 14, in view of claim 13**, Maissel discloses “further comprising receiving the content guide from a remote location,” i.e., receiving program schedule information (page 10, section 0170).

20. **Regarding claim 15, in view of claim 14**, Maissel discloses “wherein the content guide comprises a broadcast program guide,” i.e., program schedule information (page 10, section 0170).

21. **Regarding claim 18, in view of claim 11**, Maissel discloses “wherein the selectively controlling access comprises controlling searching or selection of content or content-type by a user based on the determined access rights,” i.e., the intelligent agent customizes program schedule in accordance with one or more viewer profiles to

Art Unit: 2437

eliminate certain programs from the guide that are not suitable for children (page 11, sections 0184-0199).

22. **Regarding claim 19, in view of claim 11**, Maissel discloses “wherein the selectively controlling access comprises controlling receipt of content from the receivable content by the receiver terminal based on the determined access rights,” i.e., a received program includes a broadcaster set of parameters that define information for the program including parental control information associated with at least a portion of the program requiring parental control (pages 18-19, sections 0303-0308) and parental control is control by a person who has the right to control what programs another person may view and/or record/delete and/or otherwise use (page 17, sections 0281-0282).

23. **Regarding claim 20, in view of claim 19**, Thomas discloses “wherein the controlling receipt of content comprises abstaining from receiving data burst of content determined unsuitable for access or consumption based on the determined access rights,” i.e., a synchronized moment-to-moment content type indication allows the decision and command processor to block, skip or “bleep” based on content type and set of persons in the audience, where blocking can totally block the signal (col. 8, lines 4-28).

24. **Regarding claim 23, in view of claim 1**, Thomas discloses “further comprising dynamically updating the determined access rights,” i.e., monitors users in the room and automatically controls the program content to match content suitable for the entire audience present (col. 10, lines 6-42).

25. **Regarding claim 24, in view of claim 23**, Thomas discloses “wherein the dynamically updating comprises determining a new access rights upon a triggering event comprising one of detection of a new user, detection of a user leaving the region, detection of a powering down of the wireless communications device of a detected user, and detection of a change in an access rights profile on the wireless communications device of a detected user,” i.e., detecting a user entering the room (col. 10, lines 6-42).

26. **Regarding claim 25, in view of claim 23**, Thomas discloses “further comprising dynamically updating access or consumption control of receivable content according to the updated determined access rights,” i.e., system automatically controls the program content to match a content suitable for the entire audience present (col. 10, lines 6-42).

27. **Regarding claim 26, in view of claim 1**, Maissel discloses “wherein the determined access rights is determined for a period of time,” i.e., received program can have assigned expiration time (page 7, section 0114).

28. **Regarding claim 38**, Maissel discloses “content receiver terminal for controlling user access by one or more users each having associated therewith a wireless communications device,” i.e., apparatus that receives broadcast programs (page 16, sections 0266-0268) is operated by user via remote control for parental control or control by a person who has right to control what programs another person, or persons, may view and/ or record/delete, and/or otherwise use (page 10, sections 0174 and 0179, page 11, sections 0184 and 0199, page 17, sections 0280-0282, and page 20, section 0342); “to content delivered across a communications medium,” i.e., apparatus can operate as a set top box and communicates to receive content (page 16, sections

Art Unit: 2437

0266-0268, and page 17, sections 0276-0279 and 0285); “comprising: a detection module for detecting of one or more users in at least one region in which the delivered content may be consumed via the one or more users' wireless communications devices by wireless communications,” i.e., each member of the family of the user may select a corresponding agent by using a different remote control via the I/O interface (Fig. 10B, item 115, page 17, section 0280 and page 19, sections 0321-0324); “and an access rights module for determining access rights to delivered content based on the detected one or more users,” i.e., the agent module (Fig. 10B, item 145) may determine for each associated user portions of the program which may require parental control and the user may be required to provide identification to prove that they are entitled to access a program (pages 19-20, section 0326 and page 22, sections 0375-0376); “the access rights defining a suitability of unsuitability of one or more users to consume content,” i.e., parental control is control by a person who has the right to control what programs another person or persons may view and/or record / delete, and/or otherwise use (page 17, section 0282); content requiring parental control may include programs having a rating unsuitable for children (page 10, sections 0168 and 0179).

Maissel does not specifically disclose detecting a presence of one or more users. Thomas, however, discloses “detecting a presence of one or more users in at least one region in which content receivable by at least one receiver terminal may be consumed,” i.e., user recognition input device determines that an additional user is newly present in a given area having access to the display (col. 7, lines 40-48 and col. 9, lines 14-49); “determining access rights to content based on the detected one or more users,” i.e.,

Art Unit: 2437

controlling access to information based on content of the information and user identity (col. 5, lines 43-67 and col. 6, lines 1-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maissel's television system that maintains a viewer preference profile and identifies viewers to control access to programs with Thomas's technique of detecting users in a viewing area in order to automate the detection of viewers to improve the control of access to displayed information.

29. **Regarding claim 39**, Maissel discloses "computer-readable medium encoded with processing instructions for implementing a method of controlling user access, by one or more users each having associated therewith a wireless communications device," i.e., apparatus that receives broadcast programs (page 16, sections 0266-0268) with functionality implemented by software (page 12, section 0216) is operated by user via remote control for parental control or control by a person who has right to control what programs another person, or persons, may view and/ or record/delete, and/or otherwise use (page 10, sections 0174 and 0179, page 11, sections 0184 and 0199, page 17, sections 0280-0282, and page 20, section 0342); "to content receivable across a communications medium," i.e., apparatus can operate as a set top box and communicates to receive content (page 16, sections 0266-0268, and page 17, sections 0276-0279 and 0285); "performed by a content receiver terminal, the method comprising: detecting of one or more users in at least one region in which the receivable content may be consumed via the one or more users' wireless communications devices by wireless communications," i.e., each member of the family of the user may select a

Art Unit: 2437

corresponding agent by using a different remote control via the I/O interface (Fig. 10B, item 115, page 17, section 0280 and page 19, sections 0321-0324); “and determining access rights to receivable content based on the detected one or more users, the access rights defining a suitability or unsuitability of one or more users to consume content,” i.e., parental control is control by a person who has the right to control what programs another person or persons may view and/or record / delete, and/or otherwise use (page 17, section 0282); content requiring parental control may include programs having a rating unsuitable for children (page 10, sections 0168 and 0179).

Maissel does not specifically disclose detecting a presence of one or more users. Thomas, however, discloses “detecting a presence of one or more users in at least one region in which content receivable by at least one receiver terminal may be consumed,” i.e., user recognition input device determines that an additional user is newly present in a given area having access to the display (col. 7, lines 40-48 and col. 9, lines 14-49); “determining access rights to content based on the detected one or more users,” i.e., controlling access to information based on content of the information and user identity (col. 5, lines 43-67 and col. 6, lines 1-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maissel’s television system that maintains a viewer preference profile and identifies viewers to control access to programs with Thomas’s technique of detecting users in a viewing area in order to automate the detection of viewers to improve the control of access to displayed information.

30. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maissel, in view of Thomas, and further in view of Hawley et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0021950 A1), hereinafter "Hawley".

31. Regarding claim 3, in view of claim 1, neither Maissel nor Thomas disclose that region is defined by a communications range of the receiver terminal. Hawley, however, discloses "wherein the region is defined by a communications range of the receiver terminal," i.e., reader automatically responds to tokens as they enter its read range to determine access criteria (page 4, sections 0032-0033).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maissel's television system that maintains a viewer preference profile and identifies viewers to control access to programs and Thomas's technique of detecting users in a viewing area with Hawley's technique of limiting interactions with a network based on a tangible token that can be read wirelessly by a tag reader in order to increase reliability of the detection of viewers to improve the control of access to displayed information.

32. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maissel, in view of Thomas, and further in view of Eaton et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0203377 A1), hereinafter "Eaton".

Art Unit: 2437

33. **Regarding claim 4, in view of claim 1**, neither Maissel nor Thomas disclose detecting a location of a user's communication device. Eaton, however, discloses "wherein the detecting a presence further comprises detecting a location of a user's communications device and determining whether the user's communications device is within the region," i.e., deriving an object location where object has a communication device (page 2, sections 0021-0024) and determining if the communication device within the object comes within the communication range of the group controller (page 3, sections 0027).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maissel's television system that maintains a viewer preference profile and identifies viewers to control access to programs and Thomas's technique of detecting users in a viewing area with Eaton's technique of wirelessly tracking the location of an object in order to improve reliability of the detection of the location of viewers to improve the control of access to displayed information.

34. **Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maissel, in view of Thomas, and further in view of Nickum (U.S. Patent No. US 6,359,661 B1), hereinafter "Nickum".**

35. **Regarding claim 9, in view of claim 5**, Maissel discloses "further comprising receiving an access of a user from the user's communications device," i.e., identifying a viewer based on the remote control (page 19, sections 0323-0324).

Neither Maissel nor Thomas disclose receiving an access rights level of a user from the device. Nickum, however, discloses “receiving an access rights level of a user from the user’s communication device,” i.e., user IDs associated with access rights level as well as profile information is stored in EEPROM of remote control device (col. 6, lines 38-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maissel’s television system that maintains a viewer preference profile and identifies viewers to control access to programs and Thomas’s technique of detecting users in a viewing area with Nickum’s technique of controlling user access according to programming controls in a remote control device in order to restrict access to displayed information for unauthorized viewers.

36. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maissel, in view of Thomas, and further in view of Kwoh et al. (U.S. Patent No. US 6,115,057), hereinafter “Kwoh”.

37. Regarding claim 16, in view of claim 15, Maissel discloses “wherein the content guide comprises one or more items indicating receivable content or content-type, the items being configured in a hierarchical parent-child structure,” i.e., selectable icons represent program subject matter and are ordered in a hierarchical relationship (page 15, sections 0254-0259).

Neither Maissel nor Thomas disclose an access rating of a child item cannot exceed an access rating of a parent item. Kwoh, however, discloses “wherein the content guide comprises one or more items indicating receivable content or content-type, the items being configured in a hierarchical parent-child structure in which an access rating of a child item can not exceed an access rating of a parent item,” i.e., the rating data device ranks the order of the rating levels from highest rating G to lowest rating X in a rating hierarchy, where for example a if a desired rating level is PG-13 and a received video segment has a rating level of R then the video segment has a lower than desired rating level (Fig. 26, item 750, col. 17, lines 46-67 and col. 18, lines 1-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maissel’s television system that maintains a viewer preference profile and identifies viewers to control access to programs and Thomas’s technique of detecting users in a viewing area with Kwoh’s technique of providing parental control in a television receiver in order to broaden control in restricting access to displayed information.

38. **Regarding claim 17, in view of claim 16**, Kwoh discloses “wherein the filtering comprises preventing processing of an unsuitable item and any associated child items of the content guide based on the determined access rights,” i.e., extracted rating data is compared to the desired rating level, and if the extracted rating data has a lower rating level than the desired rating data, then the video and audio are blocked from the television monitor (col. 19, lines 9-36).

Art Unit: 2437

39. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maissel, in view of Thomas, and further in view of Herweck et al. (U.S. Patent No. US 5,731,763), hereinafter “Herweck”.

40. Regarding claim 21, in view of claim 20, neither Maissel nor Thomas disclose powering down content receiving components of the receiver terminal. Herweck, however, discloses “wherein the abstaining from receiving data burst comprises powering down at least content receiving components of the receiver terminal during data bursts of content determined unsuitable,” i.e., the receiver provides a power cut-off and receives authorization signals for controlling the power to the television receiver (col. 2, lines 30-49 and col. 5, lines 1-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maissel’s television system that maintains a viewer preference profile and identifies viewers to control access to programs and Thomas’s technique of detecting users in a viewing area with Herweck’s access control technique that secures a television from use in order to increase granularity of access control in a protected system.

41. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maissel, in view of Thomas, in view of Herweck, and further in view of Chapman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,216,228 B1), hereinafter “Chapman”.

Art Unit: 2437

42. **Regarding claim 22, in view of claim 21**, neither Maissel nor Thomas nor Herweck disclose an electronic watermark. Chapman, however, discloses “further comprising receiving receivable content including an electronic watermark indicating an access rating for the content,” i.e., a controller receives and extracts a watermark to obtain content classification codes and determines to display content based on the classification code (col. 7, lines 10-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maissel’s television system that maintains a viewer preference profile and identifies viewers to control access to programs and Thomas’s technique of detecting users in a viewing area and Herweck’s access control technique that secures a television from use with Chapman’s technique of controlling display of data by embedding content classification information in a digital watermark in order to securely communicate access control data to improve access control protection of a system.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Evans et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0081043 A1) discloses parental controls for digital media to restrict multiple user's access.

Gutta et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0194586 A1) discloses automatically generating recommendations of entertainment options based on detected users and weighted user preferences.

Liebnaw (U.S. Patent No. 6,530,083 B1) discloses adjusting the settings of a system based on combined user preferences.

Yeap et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2006/0123463 A1) discloses a security system that verifies authentication information periodically to ensure that the device is still proximal to the computer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hilary Branske whose telephone number is (571) 270-3395. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2437

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437